

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
239	Mr. David Hawkins	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>(b) (6)</p> <p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I totally agree with the above statement.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(b) (6)</p>
292	Mr. Ruben Garcia	4	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>(b) (6)</p> <p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Let the animals roam. We humans can think of creative ways to get fed without this pollution.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(b) (6)</p>
134	Kathy Tibbits		<p>Comment submitted by Save the Illinois River, Inc. member Katy Tibbits of Stilwell, OK.</p> <p>Thank you Ed Brocksmith Secretary-Treasurer STIR, Inc.</p> <p>As an attorney, I have practiced before the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture on permitting. (b) (6)</p> <p>(b) (6)</p> <p>Kathy Tibbits</p> <p>-- Kathy Tibbits, Attorney, OBA#10233, Licensed, US Supreme Court, P.O. Box 1116, Stilwell, OK 74960, 918-797-5016, kathytibbits@kathytibbits.com This may be a confidential communicate intended for a certain recipient. If received by mistake, kindly notify the sender immediately.</p>
163	Red Goldfarb		<p>Dear Mrs. Smith,</p> <p>I thought I heard everything until somebody told me the EPA is about to let the OK Dept. of Ag regulate water pollution spills for CAFOs and pesticides in Oklahoma. Not the Dept. of Environmental Quality like other states, but the state agency already in bed with Big Agriculture is going to fine their rich buddies for polluting the water and fouling up the air the rest of us have to drink and smell. That will happen when chickens have lips and snakes have hips!</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The Dept. of Ag has the clearest possible conflict of interest which will make strong regulation totally impossible.</p> <p>Of course Dept. of Ag and the CAFOS want more animal factories stuffed full of suffering animals -- 50 new CAFO general permits and 10 new individual permits each year. Their budget shows income from giving out permits and licenses, but not from fining anybody in Big Ag -- which has a history of horrible pollution spills in Oklahoma that get cleaned up at taxpayer expense. Looks like they already don't expect to write anybody up or collect any fine money. Those CAFOs from Arkansas and NE Oklahoma are the reason for green slime (algee bloom) that is already making people sick in northeast Oklahoma. You can't even swim at the lake in the summer now. Just wait until they've got 60 new CAFOs a year. Dept. of Ag has to promote this growth to fund their new program and make up for budget cuts. This thing is just a fundraiser for the Dept. of Ag after 20% state budget cuts over the past few years left them in the hole.</p> <p>I heard that when a state takes over regulating water spills for the EPA, that state is supposed to have standards at least as strict as the EPA plus enough money, people and real interest in keeping water quality up and getting the job don right. Trust me on this. We don't have any of that in OK if the Dept. of Ag is in charge. In this state, the Dept. of Ag is not even in charge of all the spills because the Corp Com and Dept. of Environmental Quality control some of it. Besides isn't that supposed to be something the federal government controls between states when spills from other states leak over into Oklahoma and our spills leak over into other states?</p> <p>We will be sorry if EPA lets the fox watch this hen house in Oklahoma. It's a bad idea that will make taxpayers have to pay for pollution caused by a rich out of state industry with powerful political friends. Don't fall for it! Say no now before it is too late.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Red Goldfarb (b) (6)</p>
302	Jackie Gaston	<p>Dear Ms. Smith.</p> <p>I understand that Oklahoma would be the only state to trust this regulatory responsibility to a department of agriculture if the EPA grants approval to the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry for its Agricultural Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. This would a conflict of interest because ODAFF could not concurrently promote and regulate the same industry – especially when CAFO producers sit on the Board of Agriculture.</p> <p>It is also a mistake to think that Indian County, which is supposed to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>be technically exempt, would not be hurt by water pollution generated by 50 new CAFO National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general permits and 10 new individual permits proposed by ODAFF for each year.</p> <p>The EPA requires that states that are authorized to develop their own wastewater policies must comply with federal government standards, ensuring that the state regulations of CAFOs discharges must be as stringent or more stringent than the federal government standards. Based on past history, this will be impossible in Oklahoma.</p> <p>ODAFF created a special class of Animal Feeding Operations (AFOS), which would be permitted as medium-sized CAFOs, but doesn't come up with regulatory requirements for AFOs. Therefore, the rules are "less stringent" than EPA CAFO requirements.</p> <p>ODAFF doesn't have a plan for apply Oklahoma's Water Quality Standards to AFOs and SAFOs located in High Quality Waters and outstanding Resource Waters.</p> <p>ODAFF's penalties for violation of the AgPDES are less stringent than federal penalties for violations of the same rules.</p> <p>ODAFF proposes only one new enforcement officer to investigate, and resolve or litigate spills for the whole state, indicating they do not even intend to take that responsibility seriously.</p> <p>Furthermore, ODAFF does not have jurisdiction over a large portion of discharges, which are under the jurisdiction of either the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality or the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, as noted in the Supplementary Information section of the Federal Register Vol. 77, No. 185/Monday, September 24, 2012/Notices, p. 58831.</p> <p>Environmental leaders fought hard for a decade to protect Oklahomans from CAFOs, who have a history of operating in bad faith at taxpayers' expense. We do not want to lose what we fought for through this application. For all of these reasons, please do not approve authorization of the AgPDES program requested by ODAFF.</p> <p>Jackie Gaston (b) (6)</p>
162	Phyllis Bryant	<p>Dear Ms. Smith:</p> <p>Please deny the Oklahoma Dept. of Agriculture, Food and Forestry's (ODAFF's) request to regulate water pollution (point source discharges) associated for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs). Most other states trust the state department of environmental quality – not the agency that has been historically in bed with the worst</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>polluters. How could ODAFF even hope to get effective control over big polluters in the CAFO industry when the same producers sit on the governing board of the agriculture agency? It is also a mistake to think that Indian County, which is supposed to be technically exempt, would not be hurt by water pollution generated by 50 new CAFO National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general permits and 10 new individual permits proposed by ODAFF for each year.</p> <p>Yet ODAFF plans to have only one new enforcement officer to protect and improve the state's waters, while four new staff would issue permits and licenses to expand the CAFO industry.</p> <p>Environmental leaders fought hard for a decade and won a lot of battles to protect Oklahoma citizens from CAFOs in terms of our health and wasted taxpayer dollars needed to clean up messes that rightfully were the responsibility of the industry that made money while creating them. Please don't turn back the environmental clock in our state with an quick decision. Please make the right decision. Thank you.</p> <p>Phyllis Bryant (b) (6)</p>
180	Arnoldo Portillo	f	<p>From: Arnoldo Portillo &lt;arnold_portillo@seaboardfoods.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			Sincerely, ArnoldoPortillo <arnold_portillo@seaboardfoods.com> Guymon, Oklahoma
177	Bert Luthi	f	<p>From: Bert Luthi (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, BertLuthi (b) (6) Sharon, OK</p>
176	Blanca Vazquez	f	<p>From: Blanca Vazquez (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  BlancaVazquez (b) (6)  Hennessey, Oklahoma</p>
272	Brett Ramsey	f	<p>From: Brett Ramsey &lt;brett@blueandgoldsausage.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  BrettRamsey &lt;brett@blueandgoldsausage.com&gt;  Jones, Oklahoma</p>
178	Cathy Vaughan	f	<p>From: Cathy Vaughan &lt;cathyvaughan@murphybrownllc.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>(ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, CathyVaughan &lt;cathyvaughan@murphybrownllc.com&gt; Rosston, OK</p>
300	CheyenneDixon	f	<p>From: Cheyenne Dixon &lt;cheyennedixon@murphybrownllc.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Sincerely,  CheyenneDixon &lt;cheyennedixon@murphybrownllc.com&gt;  Laverne, OK</p>
167	Coy McCorkle	f	<p>From: Coy McCorkle (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a friend of a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  CoyMcCorkle (b) (6)  Holdenville, OK</p>
165	DaleRamsey	f	<p>From: Dale Ramsey (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a friend of pork producers in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, DaleRamsey (b) (6) Holdenville, OK</p>
169	David McMullen	f	<p>From: David McMullen (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, DavidMcMullen (b) (6) Minco, Oklahoma</p>
168	David Wade	f	<p>From: David Wade (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, DavidWade &lt;dwade@hanorusa.com&gt; Spring Green, Wisconsin</p>
303	Eddie Robinson	f	<p>From: EDDIE ROBINSON (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  EDDIE ROBINSON (b) (6)  HOLDENVILLE, OKLAHOMA</p>
172	JenniferNelson	f	<p>From: Jennifer Nelson &lt;jennifer_nelson@seaboardfoods.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  Jennifer Nelson &lt;jennifer_nelson@seaboardfoods.com&gt;  Shawnee Mission, Kansas</p>
181	jim crane	f	<p>From: jim crane &lt;crane@ptsi.net&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, jimcrane (b) (6) guymon, ok</p>
171	Joe Popplewell		<p>From: Joe Popplewell &lt;joe_popplewell@seaboardfoods.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, JoePopplewell &lt;joe_popplewell@seaboardfoods.com&gt; Hennessey, OK</p>
174	JohnHardaway	f	<p>From: John Hardaway (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, JohnHardaway (b) (6) Enid, OK</p>
286	Juan Ovalle	f	<p>From: Juan Ovalle &lt;juanovalle@murphybrownllc.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  JuanOvalle &lt;juanovalle@murphybrownllc.com&gt;  Laverne, Oklahoma</p>
284	Kara Thex	f	<p>From: Kara Thex (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  KaraThex (b) (6)  Laverne, OK</p>
164	Lori Ramsey	f	<p>From: Lori Ramsey &lt;lori.ramsey@tyson.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, LoriRamsey &lt;lori.ramsey@tyson.com&gt; Holdenville, OK</p>
285	Martha Martinez	f	<p>From: Martha Martinez &lt;gracemartinez@murphybrownllc.com&gt; Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, MarthaMartinez &lt;gracemartinez@murphybrownllc.com&gt; Beaver, Oklahoma</p>
166	Patty Fariss	f	<p>From: Patty Fariss (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>(ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a friend of pork producers in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  PattyFariss (b) (6)  Holdenville, OK</p>
179	RICHARD ROBINSON	f	<p>From: RICHARD ROBINSON (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  RICHARDROBINSON (b) (6)  HOLDENVILLE, OKLAHOMA</p>
173	ROBERTMCCULLOCH	f	<p>From: ROBERT MCCULLOCH (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  ROBERTMCCULLOCH (b) (6)  GUYMON, OK</p>
170	Thomas Sewell	f	<p>From: Thomas Sewell &lt;tsewell@hitchok.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, ThomasSewell &lt;tsewell@hitchok.com&gt; Guymon, Oklahoma</p>
175	TravisVaughan	f	<p>From: Travis Vaughan &lt;managerselctninesow@murphybrownllc.com&gt;</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p> <p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely, TravisVaughan &lt;managerselctninesow@murphybrownllc.com&gt; Laverne, OK</p>
238	Wathina Luthi	f	<p>From: Wathina Luthi (b) (6)</p> <p>Subject: Comment on Docket Number: FRL-9731-4</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>" I am writing to express my support for the application submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) for authorization of the Agriculture Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AgPDES) pursuant to Section 402(b) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Authorization for the AgPDES program at ODAFF has been a priority of the State of Oklahoma for almost 20 years. In 1994, the Oklahoma Legislature passed legislation directing ODAFF to pursue this authorization. This is an effort that has broad public support across the state. Legislation creating the AgPDES program was supported by an overwhelming bi-partisan majority in the Oklahoma House and Senate and the legislature has already allocated more than \$670,000 for administration of the program.</p> <p>As a pork producer in Oklahoma, I believe there is great value in state and federal agencies working together on programs like the AgPDES program. Approval of this application will eliminate duplication of services between ODAFF and Region 6 EPA.</p> <p>Again, I respectfully request EPA approve the application from the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry for authorization of the AgPDES program. "</p> <p>Sincerely,  WathinaLuthi (b) (6)  Gage, Oklahoma</p>
304	Susie Shields Derichsweiler	<p>From: "Susie Shields Derichsweiler" (b) (6)  To: Denise Hamilton/R6/USEPA/US@EPA  Date: 11/08/2012 10:12 PM  Subject: Comments for Oklahoma State Program  Administration of NPDES Program</p> <p>EPA Comments on State program requirements  Application to Administer Partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program; Oklahoma  FRL-9731-4  Dear Ms. Hamilton:</p> <p>As a non-technical person, I would like to provide my concerns regarding the assignment of Oklahoma NPDES permitting and enforcement to the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) in layman's terms. In my experience over the past sixteen years of dealing with ODAFF, they have been controlled by the Pork Council (which consists of representatives from CAFO operators) and the Farm Bureau (an insurance company primarily for CAFOs) with several highly paid lobbyists. My sister is the top Oklahoma producer of Berkshire show pigs and a member of the Pork Council, but they do not give her the time of day. I do not see how ODAFF can bite the hand that feeds them to keep the CAFO operations in line.</p> <p>If EPA could oversee the hiring of the staff members for the new</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>CAFO permitting section, I would feel much better. They should have a background check to see which CAFO owner they are related to or friends with. That is often how state government works in Oklahoma. After the permitting process is completed, how many inspections will they conduct and who will do them? What kind of enforcement authority will they have and how will they use it? How many more people will they be hiring and how influenced will they be by “Big Ag”? How will ODAFF pay for this new program? For ODAFF to assume regulatory responsibility for point source discharges associated with concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), the application of biological pesticides or chemical pesticides that leave a residue, silviculture activities and storm water from agricultural activities is sure to create undue pollution if not regulated properly.</p> <p>Personally, I think ODAFF has a huge conflict of interest since they are primarily a promotional and cheerleading outfit for “Big Ag”, not a regulatory agency. Actually, I have an idea for the regulatory system. What if ODAFF issued the permits and ODEQ monitored and enforced them. In return, ODAFF could inspect and enforce the industrial permits issued to corporations and municipalities by the DEQ. This would prevent each agency from “biting the hand that feeds them.” Also, in Oklahoma, most of our legislators attempt to interfere with regulatory agencies making attempts to assess fines for permit violations in their own legislative districts.</p> <p>This would be the only state in Region 6 granted NPDES oversight by the Department of Agriculture ... I think it is a BIG mistake!</p> <p>Best Regards, Virginia Sue (Susie) Shields (b) (6)</p>
159	Nancy Smart	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a concerned citizen of Oklahoma. I am alarmed at the thought of the Department of Agriculture regulating concentrated feeding animal operations in Oklahoma. This presents a clear conflict of interests. CAFO producers sit on the Board of Agriculture. Their first concern will be for their business to be profitable not protecting the air, land and water of Oklahoma. Please don't allow this situation to come about in Oklahoma.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Smart (b) (6)</p>
158	Pat Hoerth	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I urge you to deny the request by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) to assume regulatory responsibility for point source discharges associated with concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), the application of biological pesticides or chemical pesticides that leave a residue, silviculture activities and storm water from agricultural activities.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>ODAFF clearly has a conflict of interest in attempting to concurrently promote and regulate the same industry, especially when that industry has, by EPA's definition, a potential pollution profile. How can we expect the state agency responsible for expanding agriculture and livestock production to take strong and effective enforcement action against the state's largest agricultural producers -- Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) -- who are the most likely to commit fineable offenses?</p> <p>Oklahoma would be the only state to allow the Department of Ag to regulate the CAFOs. Instead, I strongly support the approval of the Department of Environmental Quality to protect the public interest and water quality from the pollution of CAFOs.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Pat Hoerth -- Pat Hoerth (b) (6)</p>
301	Tim Wagner		<p>I am writing to ask to disapprove the Oklahoma Dept. of Agriculture, Food and Forestry's (ODAFF's) request to regulate water pollution (point source discharges) associated for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs). I trust the EPA, but if it has to be done at the state level, it makes more sense to trust the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality to protect the public interest and water quality from the worst pollution offenders. I understand that Oklahoma would be the only state to entrust this regulatory responsibility to a department of agriculture. Perhaps the conflict between promotion and regulations is the reason. The EPA requires that states that are authorized to develop their own wastewater policies must comply with federal government standards, ensuring that the state regulations of CAFOs discharges must be as strict or stricter than the federal government standards. Based on past history, this will be impossible in Oklahoma. Further demonstrating a preference for industry growth over regulation, ODAFF would assign only one new enforcement officer to protect and improve the state's waters, while four new staff would issue permits and licenses to expand the CAFO industry. According to the Federal Register, EPA may authorize a state to administer an equivalent state program if the state has a program sufficient to meet the act's requirements. In terms of proposed budget, human resources and intent to protect water quality, ODAFF does not. Thank you for denying authorization of the AgPDES program requested by ODAFF.</p> <p>Tim Wagner (b) (6)</p>
157	Colata Harlan		Ms. Smith, please consider denying the Oklahoma Department of

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Agriculture, Food and Forestry's (ODAFF's) AgPDES program request to assume regulatory responsibility for point source discharges associated with Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) in Oklahoma. In other states, the department of environmental quality is entrusted to protect the public interest and water quality from the worst pollution offenders. I understand that Oklahoma would be the only state to entrust this regulatory responsibility to a department of agriculture. This is a conflict of interest because ODAFF could not concurrently promote and regulate the same industry. It's a mistake to believe that ODAFF could regulate the CAFO industry when some of those same producers sit on the Board of Agriculture that directs ODAFF and hires the division directors making these decisions. It is also a mistake to think that Indian County would not be affected by the water pollution generated by 50 new CAFO National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general permits and 10 new individual permits proposed by ODAFF for each year. Thank you for reading the comments below and attached, which explain the primary reasons we ask with due respect that the EPA disapprove authorization of the ODAFF's request. It would be helpful if EPA could schedule additional hearings in the parts of the state where CAFOs are actually located. Thank you.</p> <p>Colata Harlan (b) (6)</p> <p>EPA Comments on State Program Requirements;</p> <p>Application to Administer Partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program; Oklahoma</p> <p>FRL-9731-4 10/25/12</p> <p>Why We Should Not Let the Fox Watch the Hen House</p> <p>On behalf of Oklahomans currently protected by the Clear Water Act, we ask you to deny the request by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) to assume regulatory responsibility for point source discharges associated with concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), the application of biological pesticides or chemical pesticides that leave a residue, silviculture activities and storm water from agricultural activities.</p> <p>ODAFF clearly has a conflict of interest in attempting to concurrently promote and regulate the same industry, especially when that industry has, by EPA's definition, a potential pollution profile. How can we expect the state agency responsible for expanding agriculture and livestock production to take strong and effective enforcement action against the state's largest agricultural producers -- Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) --</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>who are the most likely to commit fineable offenses?</p> <p>This seems most unlikely when you consider some of those same producers sit on the Board of Agriculture that directs ODAFF and hires the division directors making these decisions.</p> <p>In other states, it's the department of environmental quality that is entrusted to protect the public interest and water quality from the worst pollution offenders. I understand that Oklahoma would be the only state to entrust this regulatory responsibility to a department of agriculture. Perhaps the conflict between promotion and regulations is the reason.</p> <p>The EPA requires that states that are authorized to develop their own wastewater policies must comply with federal government standards, ensuring that the state regulations of CAFOs discharges must be as strict or stricter than the federal government standards. Based on past history, this will be impossible in Oklahoma.</p> <p>We know ODAFF plans for Oklahoma to have higher concentrations of CAFOs. They propose adding 50 new CAFO National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general permits and 10 new individual permits each year, according to budget data in ODAFF's Program Description, Chapter 4: Resources and Funding, page 3.</p> <p>After struggling with 20 percent state budget cuts in recent years, ODAFF needs new revenue sources. One wonders, however, why there is no income proposed in the proposed budget from the collection of CAFO fines – unless the agency doesn't plan to fine CAFOs.</p> <p>Despite plans for unprecedented annual growth in the number of CAFOs, ODAFF proposes hiring only eight new employees, who would join 22 current staff with other assignments to form the new Agricultural Services Management Division.</p> <p>Further demonstrating a preference for industry growth over regulation, ODAFF would assign only one new enforcement officer to protect and improve the state's waters, while four new staff would issue permits and licenses to expand the CAFO industry. The remaining three positions would be new, mid-level managers.</p> <p>Will one new enforcement officer be enough to handle the new workload, if the point source discharge program is transferred from EPA to the state?</p> <p>According to the EPA, states with high concentrations of CAFOs experience on average 20 to 30 serious water quality problems per year as a result of manure management issues, as reported in Impacts of Waste from Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations on Water Quality <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1817674/">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1817674/</a>.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>We know toxic spills will happen. Previous Oklahoma Attorney General Drew Edmondson filed well-known lawsuits against Arkansas poultry companies based on of the devastating impact of contaminated water flowing downstream from negligent animal production factories.</p> <p>Would ODAFF have enough staff available to investigate, and resolve or litigate these spills and do they even intend to take that responsibility seriously?</p> <p>Assurances in Section VI Enforcement of the Memorandum of Agreement between EPA and ODAFF promise immediate correction of violations which endanger public health or the environment, page 28. However, the Enforcement Management System's (EMS's) Chapter 1, page 1, describes an enforcement process involving seven reviewing officials. The EMS apparently takes a more lenient approach to enforcement than the MOA:</p> <p>The enforcement responses are suggested responses and reflect the enforcement actions available to the ODAFF.... Strict compliance with this guidance is not necessary as the ODAFF maintains enforcement discretion.</p> <p>According to the Federal Register, EPA may authorize a state to administer an equivalent state program if the state has a program sufficient to meet the act's requirements. In terms of proposed budget, human resources and intent to protect water quality, ODAFF does not.</p> <p>Furthermore, ODAFF does not have jurisdiction over a large portion of discharges, which are under the jurisdiction of either the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality or the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, as noted in the Supplementary Information section of the Federal Register Vol. 77, No. 185/Monday, September 24, 2012/Notices, p. 58831.</p> <p>If the EPA lets the fox watch this hen house in Oklahoma, who will protect citizens, property and businesses from CAFO owners who spend millions on technology to inhumanely produce massive quantities of meat or eggs, but refuse to invest in technologies and practices to properly treat wastes that are by-products of their industry?</p> <p>For all of these reasons, we ask with due respect that the EPA disapprove authorization of the AgPDES program requested by ODAFF.</p> <p>Colata Harlan (b) (6)</p>
183	Dr. Cindy Pilgrim	4	Nov 5, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Come on. This is a conflict of interest for Pete's sake!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Cindy Pilgrim (b) (6)</p>
248	Dr. Fran Stallings	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We need ODAFF to be an impartial and scientific advisor to our states' farmers and ranchers.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Fran Stallings (b) (6)</p>
188	Dr. Jennifer Saltzstein	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that our food system is out of control; exceptions like these reward those who seek to destroy the environment for financial profit.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Jennifer Saltzstein (b) (6)</p>
234	Dr. Moe Karami	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is absolutely imperative that the request be turned down. Our environment has been poluted beyond what it should be thanks to poluters and their crony law makers. Enough is enough.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Moe Karami (b) (6)</p>
191	Dr. Susan Caldwell	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is essential that we oppose such pollution!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Susan Caldwell (b) (6)</p>
187	Dr. Valerie Fuller	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is clearly a conflict of interest.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Valerie Fuller (b) (6)</p>
200	Miss Kelsey Spears	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am concerned that the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture would put profits over protecting our clean water in Oklahoma. Please stop this from happening.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Kelsey Spears  (b) (6)</p>
232	Mr. Anthony Rodriguez	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 212 946 239">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 862 306">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 346 1414 510">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 550 1062 577">I oppose the ODAFF application!</p> <p data-bbox="670 617 1146 644">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 684 1474 814">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 854 1247 882">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 921 1435 1014">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1054 1451 1184">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1224 1401 1251">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1291 1419 1421">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1461 1443 1554">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1593 1263 1621">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p data-bbox="670 1661 1471 1824">As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1864 789 1892">Sincerely,</p> <p data-bbox="670 1932 951 1959">Mr. Anthony Rodriguez</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			(b) (6)
224	Mr. Brandan Crabill	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Brandan Crabill (b) (6)</p>
229	Mr. Brian A	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>as an American, I was under the belief that our country's leaders and organizations would carry out their responsibilities to the people to help them grow in comfort of their nation. The fact that someone has to step up and tell these so called - Leaders and organizations how to do their friggin' jobs shows just how irresponsible they have all become. All I have to say is make it right.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Brian A (b) (6)</p>
216	Mr. Chris Gibson	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is a serious conflict off interest</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Chris Gibson  (b) (6)</p>
228	Mr. Cloud Phillips	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012  Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The Illinois watershed is already fucked... Let's streamline the process and ruin all of the states sources of potential potable water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Cloud Phillips (b) (6)</p>
194	Mr. David Braden	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 7A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. David Braden  (b) (6)</p>
209	Mr. David Franklin	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The department of Ag does a good job advocating for agriculture in Oklahoma but this is a job where someone needs to advocate for water first. Do not transfer the authority to someone who would be conflicted when making judgement calls.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. David Franklin (b) (6)</p>
240	Mr. Donald Peacock	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Our descendants will need clean water</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Donald Peacock</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			(b) (6)
182	Mr. Frank Anderson	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Oklahoma is a beautiful land. The people deserve to have the people with the power to make such a decision to make the right decision for clean water for all of us.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Frank Anderson (b) (6)</p>
189	Mr. Gary Herdman	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>With weather change so prominent, we must be overly cautious with our water supplies. We cannot allow short sighted decisions to be made.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Gary Herdman (b) (6)</p>
246	Mr. Ivan Hutchcroft	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Do not sacrifice clean water for the future in order to provide short term corporate profits.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Ivan Hutchcroft (b) (6)</p>
185	Mr. Jack Pursell	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am a taxpayer residing in the state of Oklahoma and I am opposed to the proposed change.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Jack Pursell  (b) (6)</p>
236	Mr. James Oglesby	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It should be "at least" a full NPDES program!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. James Oglesby  (b) (6)</p>
211	Mr. Jamie Tacker	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We shouldn't compromise the health of our water, for the profits of "farm" corporations. Farming should have never been taken over by companies.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Jamie Tacker (b) (6)</p>
223	Mr. Jeff Brown	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The ODAFF clearly has a conflict of interest when it comes to this nor the adequate resources to handle.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Mr. Jeff Brown  (b) (6)</p>
201	Mr. Joey Paz	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please reject any measure that would allow ODAFF to administer this program. It is an egregious and dangerous conflict of interest.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Joey Paz (b) (6)</p>
204	Mr. John Hartman	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Now that the ODAFF has applied to take over this permitting function. The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO's adhere to the Clean Water Act, and also has a dangerous conflict of interest: how can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. John Hartman (b) (6)</p>
251	Mr. John Jolley	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please keep our waters clean for now and the future. Water will become the most valuable resource in the world soon (it already is but is taken for granted). Protect it NOW.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. John Jolley (b) (6)</p>
254	Mr. Joseph Graham	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Here's what you already know: It's easier to prevent a mess than clean p a mess.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Joseph Graham (b) (6)</p>
264	Mr. Joseph Spitz	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The EPA is in a much better position to decide whether or not to issue these permits. State agencies are underfunded and too susceptible to political pressure on environmental issues.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mr. Joseph Spitz (b) (6)</p>
241	Mr. Ken Barnes	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Thank you for listening!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Ken Barnes (b) (6)</p>
244	Mr. Kim Roberts	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>NO!!</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Kim Roberts (b) (6)</p>
233	Mr. Larry Darnell	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>WE are ruining this country</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Larry Darnell  (b) (6)</p>
210	Mr. Michael White	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am a farmer, land owner, and tax payer in this great state of Oklahoma. I have seen with my own eyes what this concentrated waste does to the enviroment. I love to fish with my grandchildren and friends, if you go to NW OK and look at the streams, rivers, and lakes, you can plainly see the impact on these treasures. It is not that expensive nor time consuming to treat this animal waste properly, and it can be used in benefical way to help improve the land, not harm it nor the wildlife.Quit letting big money and politics RUIN our irreplaceable wildlife habitat !!!!!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Michael White (b) (6)</p>
218	Mr. Mike Dumford	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The EPA should be the permitting and oversight agency for discharge from Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO's).</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry's (ODAFF) neither has the resources nor the inclination to vigorously regulate this waste.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			Mr. Mike Dumford (b) (6)
203	Mr. Nicholas Hartman	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Now that the ODAFF has applied to take over this permitting function. The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO's adhere to the Clean Water Act, and also has a dangerous conflict of interest: how can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Nicholas Hartman (b) (6)</p>
262	Mr. Patrick Spurlock	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have reasons to believe that the end results of such a decision would be disastrous and I urge you to reconsider your rash course of action.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Patrick Spurlock (b) (6)</p>
206	Mr. Philip Delacruz	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>History shows that the state of Oklahoma does not have the resources (or political will) to ensure compliance by large Agg companies. We need to protect our waters.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Philip Delacruz</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			(b) (6)
205	Mr. Robert Mcilroy	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Humans are animals too. Don't let clean water slip away from us!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Robert Mcilroy (b) (6)</p>
213	Mr. Ross Paulger	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I urge you to not bow to corporate interests at the expense of environmental protections.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Ross Paulger (b) (6)</p>
225	Mr. Stephen Frazier	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Aren't we having enough water problems in Oklahoma already without allowing animal waste to be discharged into our water supplies? Require the CAFO operations clean the water before discharging it into our streams and rivers. We already have ENOUGH water pollution in this state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Stephen Frazier (b) (6)</p>
265	Mr. Steve Trammell	4	Nov 5, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Protection of clean water is a matter for all on the nation. Runoff from factory farms can effect water in adjacent states, so it becomes an interstate matter. This is the job of the EPA</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mr. Steve Trammell  (b) (6)</p>
192	Mr. Terry Ratliff	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I did fight in a war for freedom to have my country ruined</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Terry Ratliff (b) (6)</p>
261	Mr. Theodore Plottner	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>do you get it????????????????????????????????????</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Theodore Plottner (b) (6)</p>
235	Mr. Tyler Sullivan	4	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This conflict of interest could lead to contamination of us and our</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>environment.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Tyler Sullivan (b) (6)</p>
207	Mr. Venson Fields	Nov 5, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Stop letting big business f*** up my water!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Venson Fields  (b) (6)</p>
237	Mr. Victor Sansalone	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>How can ODAFF support pollution!?! </p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Victor Sansalone  (b) (6)</p>
208	Mr. Warren Osborn	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is madness</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Warren Osborn (b) (6)</p>
260	Mr. William Cunningham	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Oklahoma will not protect the environment for the general public.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. William Cunningham  (b) (6)</p>
220	Mr. William Modrall	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>PRS</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. William Modrall (b) (6)</p>
186	Mrs. Abby Dougherty	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We need a policing group that doesn't have such a conflict of interest. Keeping Oklahoma beautiful and clean is so important and we much protect this land lest our great grandchildren be left with nothing. Please do the right thing and oppose the application.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Abby Dougherty (b) (6)</p>
245	Mrs. Carol Watson	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The environment is the second most important asset we can leave to our first most important asset -- our children.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,  Mrs. Carol Watson  (b) (6) [REDACTED]</p>
226	Mrs. Donna Waltman	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am against these large, animal-crowding operations on the basis of anti-cruelty. I am against water pollution because I want clean water to drink.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Donna Waltman (b) (6)</p>
249	Mrs. Janet Hornsby	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am against this conflict of interest.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Janet Hornsby (b) (6)</p>
215	Mrs. Leslie Smith	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Clean water is extremely important. Let's not risk this possible conflict of interest. We need the EPA to protect our land and water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Leslie Smith  (b) (6)</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
219	Mrs. Ludmila Dmitriev-Odier	<p data-bbox="670 212 816 239">Nov 5, 2012</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 1032 373">Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 413 862 441">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 480 1463 709">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1463 1010">Dear [Decision Maker], I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1050 1146 1077">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1117 1474 1346">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1386 1247 1413">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1453 1466 1614">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1654 1469 1785">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1824 1398 1852">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1892 1419 1946">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Ludmila Dmitriev-Odier (b) (6)</p>
243	Mrs. Marjorie Hass	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please take the right action on this.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Marjorie Hass (b) (6)</p>
259	Mrs. Mary Lea Wallace	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Let's leave the dedicated experts on charge of preserving water purity. Don't hire the foxes to guard our chickens. Whether it's our own drinking water, or our tax dollars spent on pollution abatement, we all have a stake in this decision.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Mrs. Mary Lea Wallace  (b) (6)</p>
202	Mrs. Michelle Price	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Clean water resources are a huge issue and Oklahoma has the opportunity to be ahead of the rest by protecting what we still have - for our children's sake.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Michelle Price (b) (6)</p>
230	Mrs. Nicole Chau	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We need to stop polluting our water. CAFOs produce too much manure to deal with economically and environmentally. Do NOT allow ODAFF the ability to permit companies that will pollute our water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Nicole Chau (b) (6)</p>
257	Mrs. Rachel Gurfinkel Hicks	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I do not trust ODAFF to regulate themselves in the interest of Oklahoma residents.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Rachel Gurfinkel Hicks  (b) (6)</p>
190	Mrs. Sarah Hall	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Sarah Hall  (b) (6)</p>
252	Mrs. Shirley Bryant	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This would be insanity - expecting the enablers to police the the polluters. How many times do the people of OK have to pay - \$ and health-wise - for the conflict of interest of underfunded departments with conflicts of interest re big business ignoring our environmental needs?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Shirley Bryant (b) (6)</p>
263	Mrs. Terri Sanders	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Be a leader for once and do whats right, not whats profitable.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Mrs. Terri Sanders  (b) (6)</p>
195	Ms. Ashley Roy	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Oklahoma is backwards in so many ways. Let's be a leader in this.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Ashley Roy (b) (6)</p>
198	Ms. Carol Sullivan	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please listen to everyone. The industry information is incomplete and therefore, misleading.</p> <p>Thanks you!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Carol Sullivan (b) (6)</p>
212	Ms. Christina Kunz	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>As a lifelong Oklahoman, I value clean water, and the peace of mind about clean water. Livestock waste is a huge contributor to pollution in our water, and we don't need any more cutting corners when it comes to our water. Giant agribusinesses can afford to dispose of their waste in a proper manner instead of polluting our water and passing the buck to the taxpayers.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Christina Kunz (b) (6)</p>
258	Ms. Dawn Mahiya	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The concentrated pollution emitted from CAFO 's is incredibly toxic. I am opposed to CAFO's in the first place and ask that the highest authority with the best resources be put in charge of regulating this industry.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Ms. Dawn Mahiya (b) (6)</p>
242	Ms. Debe Judah	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>You don't put a fox in charge of watching the hen house.....!!!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not asingle state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Debe Judah (b) (6)</p>
227	Ms. Elizabeth Morsund	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is of utmost importance that we protect our water sources from further pollution.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Elizabeth Morsund (b) (6)</p>
184	Ms. Ingrid Young	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Ingrid Young  (b) (6)</p>
253	Ms. J C	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please dont allow this</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. J C na (b) (6)</p>
193	Ms. Judy Fowler	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Combining hundreds, often thousands of animals all together without natural vegetation or land to graze on for months is unnatural and cruel. This is not the order that nature intended. It is unfair to the animals and us, the people.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Judy Fowler  (b) (6)</p>
196	Ms. Kalli Kilmer	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Don't let greed get in the way of what is right and true!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Kalli Kilmer (b) (6)</p>
217	Ms. Kelley Smith	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have several family members who live near large animal operations. We all worry about health and quality-of-life effects of these monstrous factories.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Kelley Smith (b) (6)</p>
247	Ms. Lee Baum	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This responsibility needs to be administered by the federal government, not individual states. There is no more water or land and what we need and cherish needs protected for one and all.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Lee Baum (b) (6)</p>
231	Ms. Lindsay Dearing	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please see my request.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Lindsay Dearing  (b) (6)</p>
197	Ms. Liz Garcia	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please reconsider. Think of the amount of damage that could be done to harm our environment. We need clean water. For all who share this planet. Feed lots are harmful to our environment.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Liz Garcia (b) (6)</p>
256	Ms. Lu Eyerman	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes. ...</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Lu Eyerman  (b) (6)</p>
199	Ms. Martha Holland	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Martha Holland  (b) (6)</p>
214	Ms. Pamela Jameson	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This can't possibly be good for the health of the animals nor for us as consumers.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Pamela Jameson (b) (6)</p>
250	Ms. Patricia Wallace	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I think Oklahoma has some beautiful streams and lakes and would like to see them kept that way.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Patricia Wallace  (b) (6)</p>
255	Ms. Rachel Connaughton	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Rachel Connaughton (b) (6)</p>
222	Ms. Robin Feusner	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>stop the rubber stamping I told GOV Henry how to stop this he didn't liston</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Robin Feusner (b) (6)</p>
221	Ms. Zoe Harty	<p>Nov 5, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF's application for this pollutant, because clean water is vital for everyone.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Ms. Zoe Harty  (b) (6)</p>
279	Dr. Charles Wesner	4	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The Oklahoma Dept of Ag has a long disgraceful record in regard to CAFO regulations and enforcement. Nothing has changed that would make this body competent to take over the permitting of CAFOs in Oklahoma. The Dept of Ag and its board have made well known their hostility to the law and the EPA. It would be a grave mistake to turn over this important function to a body that makes no secret its disdain for the federal government and regulation in general.  Charles Wesner, Chair Oklahoma Sierra Club</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Charles Wesner (b) (6)</p>
270	Dr. Dr. Stan Gassaway	4	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The assurance of clean water is not the job of the Department of Agriculture. Continue on this course and face a class action lawsuit under the Clean Water Act,</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Dr. Dr. Stan Gassaway (b) (6)</p>
277	Dr. Jeremy Kuzmarov	4	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Your responsibility is to protect public health.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Jeremy Kuzmarov  (b) (6)</p>
266	Dr. John Harris	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>.1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. John Harris  (b) (6)</p>
282	Dr. Michael Beilfuss	Nov 6, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The conflict of interest is clear here. We need oversight, and we need to keep the environment healthy and safe for this and future generations. It's time to clean up the CAFOs.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Dr. Michael Beilfuss (b) (6)</p>
283	Mr. Casey Powers	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Our water is a valuable resource that we will already be having problems with in the foreseeable future. We do not need to risk any further problems with our water supply if we can avoid it. The federal government should be more able to oversee these processes with fewer potential conflicts of interest.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mr. Casey Powers (b) (6)</p>
267	Mr. duane wittman	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mr. duane wittman (b) (6)</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
273	Mr. James Loller	<p data-bbox="670 212 816 239">Nov 6, 2012</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 1032 373">Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 413 862 441">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 480 1433 709">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1474 945">Oklahoma has proved it only works for the special intrest groups not in the intrests the people. Oil and cattle are the only things the government of Oklahoma cares about. We need protection from our state leaders.</p> <p data-bbox="670 984 1146 1012">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1052 1474 1281">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1320 1247 1348">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1388 1466 1549">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1589 1466 1717">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1757 1398 1785">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1824 1474 1948">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mr. James Loller (b) (6)</p>
271	Mr. Jimmy Stewart	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I WANT CLEAN WATER IN OKLAHOMA!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Jimmy Stewart  (b) (6)</p>
268	Mr. Joel Hudson	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>When my wife was pregnant we had to get bottled water because the water in our town supply had to high of a nitrate count and was harmful to our child and kept being so until he was older. My kids</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and I love to go fishing but I taught them long ago to throw them back because of this, am I overly careful maybe but I don't care better safe than sorry. There are several times on the news when people have been told to boil their water because of E-Coli. If you allow the ODAFF to assume this job I believe these warnings will happen more often. We have a feedlot just on the east edge of our town. The story in town is they have tried to get permits too make it larger and have been turned down. If the ODAFF is in charge they will probably get it it is after all their job. Our water already smells like bleach more and more. Our water comes from under ground wells the nitrates from agriculture and lawn runoff is bad enough we don't need this headache too. Most of our wells are north and east of our town.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Joel Hudson (b) (6)</p>
275	Mr. Larry & Susan Bruce	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Stop the Department of Agriculture from Rubber Stamping CAFO's!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Larry &amp; Susan Bruce  (b) (6)</p>
274	Mr. Peter Allan Childs	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please help keep our renewable water resources, renewable.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Peter Allan Childs (b) (6)</p>
289	Mr. Phillip W.	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 212 946 237">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 862 304">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 346 1430 573">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 615 987 640">Please accept my comment</p> <p data-bbox="670 682 1143 707">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1474 976">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1018 1243 1043">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1085 1463 1245">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1287 1468 1413">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1455 1398 1480">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1522 1471 1715">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1757 1442 1850">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1892 1263 1917">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Phillip W. (b) (6)</p>
281	Mr. Robert Justice	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>CAFO's are toxic to our environment and the health of the US Citizen!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Robert Justice  (b) (6)</p>
269	Mrs. Crystal Allen	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Good day!</p> <p>I am writing this in hopes that it reaches you in the best of spirits.  Oklahoma is beautiful, loving, and united.  That is why throughout all of my travels, this is still my favorite place to call "home"</p> <p>I am entrusting you to keep it beautiful for me.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="667 243 1455 342">Please do not allow this to happen, its outrageous and between you and I, just plain gross.</p> <p data-bbox="667 380 1227 411">Your position will allow our voices to be heard.</p> <p data-bbox="667 449 1422 548">Thank you for your time and I hope you have a lovely day and a happy holidays !</p> <p data-bbox="667 585 878 648">Yours very truly, Ms. Crystal Allen</p> <p data-bbox="667 686 1146 718">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="667 753 1471 984">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1022 1243 1054">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="667 1089 1463 1257">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1295 1471 1425">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitoll to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1463 1398 1495">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="667 1530 1471 1730">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1768 1438 1866">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1904 1260 1936">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Crystal Allen  (b) (6)</p>
290	Mrs. Hannah Harder	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Oklahoma is already struggling to meet clean water act requirements and this is a huge threat to public health and ecological integrity. As a former employee of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board and environmental scientist I am quite familiar with the data of damages done by CAFOs in Oklahoma. Handing this important regulation key to this overtaxed underfunded agency would be a disaster.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Mrs. Hannah Harder (b) (6)</p>
278	Mrs. Talin Schotters	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>this seems like a conflict of interest and should not be allowed.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Talin Schotters  (b) (6)</p>
276	Ms. Aharen Richardson	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The conflict of interest between ODAFF, CAFO's and our environment endangers our beautiful Oklahoma land and water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Aharen Richardson  (b) (6)</p>
291	Ms. Andrea Teter	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I believe administration of the system must remain with the EPA. EPA's better equipped to handle this because it is a federal interstate issue. At the state level there be too much bias and inappropriate influence by business. That coupled with inadequate funding would lead to disaster for our Oklahoma environment.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Andrea Teter (b) (6)</p>
288	Ms. Charlene Posey	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Our water supply should be urgently protected.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Charlene Posey  (b) (6)</p>
287	Ms. Leslie Bradford	Nov 6, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leslie Bradford</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Leslie Bradford  (b) (6)</p>
280	Ms. Maria Welding	<p>Nov 6, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose all harmful discharges from Industries into Oklahoma waters</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Maria Welding (b) (6)</p>
295	Dr. Teresa Appleton	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Clean air and water are vital to humans. Cafo's are unnatural.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Teresa Appleton (b) (6)</p>
297	Mrs. Lee Anne Hiller	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This would be an obvious conflict of interest--they would NOT be able to oversee an industry that they support. The water quality of Oklahoma must be maintained by an organization without ties to Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Lee Anne Hiller  (b) (6)</p>
293	Mrs. Linda Langmacher	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is critical that our water supply be protected!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Linda Langmacher  (b) (6)</p>
296	Mrs. Teresa Tucker-Trainum	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is not a job for this dept.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Teresa Tucker-Trainum (b) (6)</p>
294	Ms. Mary Price	<p>Nov 7, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have lived in Oklahoma areas where there is "intense" cattle ranching. Even without being confined to feed lots, the amount of pollution the cows create is huge. Our well depended on a creek, which, upstream, the cattle liked to stand in during the heat. I quit drinking the water after I saw how they fouled it. Where will we be without clean water?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Mary Price  (b) (6)</p>
1	Ms. Rachele Aisen	<p>Oct 15, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>other states are affected</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring Clean Water protections.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Rachele Aisen (b) (6)</p>
11	Dr. Fran Stallings	4	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I see a conflict of interest for ODAFF, if it tries both to promote large feedlot operations and to monitor the pollution they can produce. I prefer to have these functions performed by separate entities.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Fran Stallings  (b) (6)</p>
18	Dr. Valerie Fuller	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>This is, at best, a huge conflict of interest...</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Valerie Fuller  (b) (6)</p>
17	Miss Ashley Greer	Oct 17, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We cannot point fingers to others if we are not keeping our own backyard properly maintained. We must fix problems as they arise instead of waiting until they are festered and more difficult to resolve.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Ashley Greer  (b) (6)</p>
24	Miss Brett French	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Stop polluting and start practicing more ethical Solutions.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Brett French  (b) (6)</p>
10	Mr. bill Lamb	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Don't pollute our water.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. bill Lamb (b) (6)</p>
27	Mr. Carl Barnwell	Oct 17, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Clean water is of the greatest importance !</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Carl Barnwell (b) (6)</p>
30	Mr. Chris Applegate	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We must meet better requirements to better protect our land and water from such operations.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Chris Applegate (b) (6)</p>
13	Mr. Chuck Gleba	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>stick with what works</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Chuck Gleba  (b) (6)</p>
14	Mr. David Dyer	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 212 946 237">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 862 304">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 346 1433 573">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 615 1463 709">I would like to have clean water and ODAFF does not represent my best interests!</p> <p data-bbox="670 751 1146 777">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 819 1474 1045">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1087 1247 1113">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1155 1466 1312">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1354 1471 1480">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1522 1401 1547">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1589 1474 1785">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1827 1442 1921">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. David Dyer  (b) (6)</p>
15	Mr. James Hancock	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>If you do not take steps to fix these problems I will remember your inaction at the ballot box.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. James Hancock (b) (6)</p>
22	Mr. James Oglesby	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Stop selling out to big business!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. James Oglesby (b) (6)</p>
9	Mr. Jeff Brown	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 212 946 239">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 862 306">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 346 1433 575">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 615 1455 676">Please prevent this huge conflict of interest from occurring and let the EPA do it's job!!</p> <p data-bbox="670 716 1146 743">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 783 1474 1012">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1052 1247 1079">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1119 1466 1281">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1320 1471 1449">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1488 1401 1516">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1556 1474 1751">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1791 1443 1885">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1925 1263 1953">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Jeff Brown (b) (6)</p>
3	Mr. Larry Shepard	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The number one goal should be to protect the surface and ground water resources of Oklahoma. If we do not have our clean air, clean water, and healthy soils to grow crops, we have lost our sustainability. Look at much of Africa, and all the hungry and sick people. Many parts of Asia are in the same situation. Do we want that for Oklahoma or America's future? I do not think so.</p> <p>If a company is to operate in our state, they should be prepared to keep the air and water clean, and if they mess it up, they should pay the cost to do so.</p> <p>Thank you for doing the right thing in advance.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Larry Shepard (b) (6)</p>
5	Mr. Marshall Neill	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Yeah, pollute the environment. Sounds like a great idea. Who would be affected? JUST ABOUT EVERYONE. Come'on, stop this crazy application.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Marshall Neill  (b) (6)</p>
23	Mr. Robert Ahrendt	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>ENLARGING THE SCOPE AND POWER OF STATE REGULATORY FUNCTIONS IS NOT MAKING STATE POLITICOS REDUCE THEIR DRAG ON TAXPAYERS, RATHER POLITICIANS WILL BE LOADING UP THE BURDENS AND COSTS WITHOUT BENEFITING TAXPAYERS. ALSO THE INFLUENCE-PEDDLING WILL GROW BY EMPOWERING THE STATE POLITICIANS TO GET DEALS WHICH DO NOT BENEFIT THE ENVIRONMENT BUT ENRICH THE POLLUTERS..</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Robert Ahrendt (b) (6) 74063-5292 (918) 245-6536</p>
26	Mr. Shawn Owen	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Don't forget, we are watching!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Shawn Owen  (b) (6)</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
7	Mrs. Carol Watson	<p data-bbox="670 212 821 239">Oct 17, 2012</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 1032 373">Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 413 862 441">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 480 1430 709">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1349 810">It is imperative that Oklahomans act in the best interest of Oklahoma.</p> <p data-bbox="670 850 1146 877">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 917 1474 1146">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1186 1247 1213">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1253 1466 1415">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1455 1469 1583">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1623 1398 1650">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1690 1474 1883">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1923 1425 1950">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Carol Watson  (b) (6)</p>
4	Mrs. Donna Davis	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Putting the fox to watch the hen house is the very definition of hypocrisy. Get real. Our water problems in this state are severe enough without ruining any more of our supplies.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Donna Davis  (b) (6)</p>
20	Mrs. Elaine Root	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Elaine Root  (b) (6)</p>
19	Mrs. Marjorie Hass	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please do the right thing.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Marjorie Hass  (b) (6)</p>
6	Mrs. Roseanne Hartman	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO's adhere to the Clean Water Act, and also has a dangerous conflict of interest: how can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Roseanne Hartman  (b) (6)</p>
21	Ms. Candace Frates	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="667 205 946 237">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="667 275 862 306">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="667 344 1463 575">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="667 613 1276 644">I am against this as well as many other voters. Stop.</p> <p data-bbox="667 682 1146 714">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="667 751 1474 982">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1020 1247 1052">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="667 1089 1466 1247">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1285 1471 1421">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1459 1401 1491">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="667 1528 1474 1728">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1766 1443 1860">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1898 1263 1929">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Candace Frates (b) (6)</p>
2	Ms. Colata Harlan	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Letting the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture regulate the corporate ag industry they also promote reminds me of letting the fox watching the hen house. Since this state agency has taken 20% state budget cuts, it is not feasible to add new responsibilities without considering:</p> <p>How many inspections will they conduct and who will do them?</p> <p>What kind of enforcement authority do they have and how will they use it?</p> <p>How many more people will they be hiring?</p> <p>How will they pay for this new program?</p> <p>Water is a precious commodity and should not be sacrificed for the profit of a few greedy corporations who inflict the worst kind of pollution on their neighbors and expect the state to clean up their messes at tax payer expense.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Colata Harlan (b) (6)</p>
29	Ms. Debe Judah	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is very disturbing. I believe it is a conflict of interest. I want the EPA to continue having control.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Debe Judah (b) (6)</p>
28	Ms. Fannie Bates	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the potential spread of swine flu due to CAFO's.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Fannie Bates  (b) (6)</p>
25	Ms. Kamisha Taylor	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>My family and i enjoy spending time on the water. We enjoy fishing and camping, and would be disappointed to know that contaminated run off is in our water. Oklahoma watee ways are a major tourist attraction. please do not allow it.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Kamisha Taylor  (b) (6)</p>
12	Ms. Kathleen Harper	Oct 17, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>While I understand that agriculture and livestock production is essential, so is clean water. The economic interests of the ODAFF should not outweigh the need for protection of water sources in Oklahoma. My concerns are also that:</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Kathleen Harper (b) (6)</p>
16	Ms. Loretta Dougherty	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is a great state and a most beautiful one. We do not need any more water pollutants to contend with in this state. Make sure you take care. There are a lot of us voters watching you.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Loretta Dougherty (b) (6)</p>
8	Ms. Martie Wyatt	<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>We in Oklahoma have many issues facing us regarding the use of this vital natural resource. We know water in Oklahoma is a finite resource, and must be protected. Any move which would lead to pollution and loss of use must be stopped. The ODAFF application will contribute to pollution.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Martie Wyatt (b) (6)</p>
31	Ms. Wilma Hays		<p>Oct 17, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Oklahoma had an intense conflict with Arkansas over water pollution in recent history. We must all acknowledge that runoff from animal waste at large operations is extremely harmful to our environment. The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture cannot adequately regulate the recent acquired task of puppy mill operations. The funding just isnt available. More importantly, the will to regulate an industry so closely tied to state policy makers leaves too much room for influence.</p> <p>Federal regulation is necessary for the health and wellbeing of the water that belongs to all Oklahomans.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p> <p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Wilma Hays (b) (6)</p>
99	Brenda Evans	4	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brenda Evans (b) (6)</p>
83	Dr. Betty White	4	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>I definitely oppose this application by ODAFF.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Betty White (b) (6)</p>
46	Dr. Elizabeth Bergey	4	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am an aquatic biologist by training, and also have an educational background (and Peace Corps experience) in animal husbandry. ODAFF has a vested interest in NOT protecting Oklahoma's waters from agricultural pollutants.</p> <p>Although most Oklahomans recognize the existence of regional water shortages, few suspect that Oklahoma has widespread problems with water quality (although blue-green algal blooms during the past 2 summers is a good indicator). Poor quality water has limited use for water supplies and recreation.</p> <p>ODEQ data from 2008 how poorly Oklahoma waters meet water quality standards. Lakes are more comprehensively monitored than flowing waters and the vast majority of lake area fits in Category 5 waters with impaired water quality that require one or more TMDLs (Total Maximum Daily Load). Of the 32,400 miles of rivers and streams considered, over 60% had no data (Category 3) and of the miles with complete data (Categories 1 and 3), almost 99% are impaired. In other words, only 121 of the 32,400 miles are known to be un-impaired. Similarly, only five of over 4,000 water bodies are known to be unimpaired.</p> <p>Allowing the ODAFF to issue permits for discharges from concentrated animal facilities would result in regional worsening of out already poor water quality.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Elizabeth Bergey (b) (6)</p>
59	Dr. James Vogh	4	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Protect our water! We have little left and need to protect all.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. James Vogh  (b) (6)</p>
61	Dr. Michael Givel	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Comments:Do Not Approve the ODAFF application</p> <p>Dear EPA,</p> <p>Please count me in opposition to the I oppose the Oklahoma Department</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This disturbing application, if approved would leave an agency with historic ties to Big Agriculture in charge of discharges related to CAFO in Oklahoma. This is clear conflict between the mission of ODAFF and making sure that CAFO operations are in compliance with the Clean Water Act. Compounding this problem are numerous lawsuits filed against CAFO operations in Oklahoma. The use of this regulatory approach would take away a vigorous means to enforce the Clean Water Act through the courts.</p> <p>Additionally, ODAFF has not demonstrated that it can adequately enforce CAFO clean water standards related to inadequate enforcement funding and enforcement personnel in ODAHF.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Michael Givel  (b) (6)</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Michael Givel  (b) (6)</p>
75	Dr. Rebecca Sherry	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please help regulate pollutants from CAFO operations for the health of people and our land and waters.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. Rebecca Sherry  (b) (6)</p>
45	Miss Charisse Piros	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Charisse Piros  (b) (6)</p>
95	Miss Darla Bennett	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>No, no, no! We have enough worries and issues with water quality with the constant contamination from the chicken plants in Arkansas. Please don't further pollute our beautiful rivers, streams and lakes. I've grown up on the Illinois River and Lake Tenkiller and have seen firsthand over the course of the last thirty years how similar pollution has changed the quality, clarity, and cleanliness of the water. This is one giant step backwards for Oklahoma.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Darla Bennett (b) (6)</p>
40	Miss Kerrie Burgess	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Kerrie Burgess</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		Miss Kerrie Burgess (b) (6)
89	Miss Linda Dempsey	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is a potentially hazardous practice that could pollute our water aquifers and endanger citizens' lives.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Linda Dempsey  (b) (6)</p>
56	Miss Rachel Cannon	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I believe that this is the responsibility of the EPA as they have more resources and less non-ethical temptation in regards to policing CAFO operations.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Miss Rachel Cannon (b) (6)</p>
106	Mr. Anthony Rodriguez	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF application!!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Mr. Anthony Rodriguez  (b) (6)</p>
101	Mr. Brian Figgins	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am gravely concerned about a conflict of interests when the department created to promote the industry also wants to control the controls and fines leveled on that same industry. Let us not have the watchdog also be the cheerleader.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Brian Figgins (b) (6)</p>
49	Mr. Bruce Lowe	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Dear [Decision Maker],</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Bruce Lowe (b) (6)</p>
107	Mr. Casey Holcomb	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 243 862 275">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 312 1463 541">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 579 1446 709">For the reasons stated below, the EPA should remain the authority responsible for issuing permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.</p> <p data-bbox="670 747 1146 779">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 816 1471 1045">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1083 1243 1115">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1152 1463 1314">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1352 1471 1482">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1520 1398 1551">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1589 1471 1787">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1824 1438 1919">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Casey Holcomb  (b) (6)</p>
63	Mr. Chadwick Cox	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I simply believe a political body whose main mission is to promote an industry should not also have regulatory responsibilities for that industry. This has been proven to be disastrous before as in the nuclear energy industry.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Chadwick Cox (b) (6)</p>
93	Mr. Charles Kaminski	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>As the President of the 89er Chapter of Trout Unlimited in</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahoma City, I represent over 460 members of Trout Unlimited and I am confident that I can speak for nearly every single one of them that this is a direct conflict of interest. Our process works best when there is a system of checks and balance - allowing the ODAFF to have total oversight for this program and the permitting function eliminates the balance portion and essentially sets up a system of nothing but checks.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Charles Kaminski (b) (6)</p>
34	Mr. Don Nelson	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The Illinois River used to be a clean, clear waterway, which I played in as a child. Today I will not permit my children near it. The waste from the chicken farms in Arkansas have ruined in for my family.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Don Nelson  (b) (6)</p>
43	Mr. Donald Peacock		<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>What good is food when there is no water or air for our descendants?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Donald Peacock (b) (6)</p>
53	Mr. duane wittman	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF application</p> <p>Dear [Decision Maker],</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. duane wittman  (b) (6)</p>
92	Mr. Erwin Hancock	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The Department of Agriculture has a clear conflict of interest as pertains to issuing permits. Please see that our clean water is protected. Thank you.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Erwin Hancock (b) (6)</p>
37	Mr. Greg Tomblin	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahoma's clean water is a vital and precious resource and must be protected from irresponsible exploitation.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Greg Tomblin</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
77	Mr. Gregory Dickson	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I do not have confidence that the ODAFF will be a good steward in monitoring the discharge of intensive agricultural operations. Please deny their application.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Gregory Dickson (b) (6)</p>
91	Mr. Jeremy Mahmood	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Wow, really? Just wow.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Jeremy Mahmood (b) (6)</p>
97	Mr. Joel Olson	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>This should become input to a renewable energy operation.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Joel Olson  (b) (6)</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
39	Mr. John Havens	<p data-bbox="670 212 821 239">Oct 18, 2012</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 1032 373">Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 413 862 441">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 480 1463 709">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1385 777">Clean Water is the issue. We must take care of this resource.</p> <p data-bbox="670 816 1146 844">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 884 1474 1113">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1152 1247 1180">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1220 1466 1381">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1421 1469 1549">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1589 1398 1617">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1656 1474 1850">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1890 1442 1948">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. John Havens (b) (6)</p>
76	Mr. John Jolley	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I live in Oklahoma and find this to be a huge issue. When are we going to do what is right and not do whatever Big Money deems for best for us (excuse me them)? Protect our water for today and the future.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. John Jolley (b) (6)</p>
84	Mr. John Teague	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. John Teague (b) (6)</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
105	Mr. Joseph Foster	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I understand the need for growth in industry to meet our constantly growing needs for both food and other materials provided by live stock. But this not be done at the cost of our environment. In doing so you poison not only ourselves but the animals we will eventually use for food and other material uses from leather to just feather pillows and the like,</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Joseph Foster (b) (6)</p>
67	Mr. Larry Bailey	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>ODAFF does not have THE FUNDING or ability to administer this program.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Larry Bailey (b) (6)</p>
78	Mr. Mark Ross	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>These CAFO operations have spread throughout the state and one doesn't have to be a scientist to see the devastaton they can have on area that they intrude upon.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Mark Ross (b) (6)</p>
86	Mr. Montie Jones	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>As outlined below, it is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry has neither the mission nor the resources to realistically protect the people and environment of the state of Oklahoma from pollution and other health hazards that result from the operations of CAFO's. This is definitely a conflict of interest that will only lead to disastrous conclusions.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Montie Jones  (b) (6)</p>
79	Mr. Nicholas Hartman	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO's adhere to the Clean Water Act, and also has a dangerous conflict of interest: how can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Nicholas Hartman  (b) (6)</p>
47	Mr. Noel Torrey	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please address this important issue.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Noel Torrey (b) (6)</p>
51	Mr. Pat Daly	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the ODAFF's application to administer discharges under the NPDES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is an obvious conflict of interest.</li> <li>- The ODAFF is not capable of holding CAFO's to acceptable pollution standards.</li> <li>- CAFO's have proven time and time again that they think they have the right to pollute our great states waters and it is their right to do so.</li> <li>- Pollution costs caused by our farmers and ranchers, unless regulated by the EPA, will cost Oklahoman's millions of dollars;</li> <li>- Treatment of drinking water</li> <li>- Lost recreation revenue due to polluted rivers, such as we already suffer in the Illinois river due to CAFO's discharge</li> <li>- No budget or truly adequate staff to within the ODAFF's</li> </ul> <p>Large scale farmers and ranchers with CAFO's are simply attempting to pass along and burden the people of Oklahoma with the cost of</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adequately treating discharge from THEIR operations.</p> <p>We cannot allow this to happen.</p> <p>The EPA is the only trusted source to regulate this.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Mr. Pat Daly  (b) (6)</p>
42	Mr. Patrick Spurlock		<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>P.S I hope you gentlemen will reconsider your decision. If you do not turn away from your current course of action, the results could be disastrous for those who depend on our state's groundwater and river water for things ranging from drinking all the way to bathing and that's just the tip of the iceberg.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Patrick Spurlock (b) (6)</p>
62	Mr. Paul Moore	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>ODAFF protecting the environment is a good example of the wolf guarding the hog house. Please, don't allow this to happen.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Paul Moore (b) (6)</p>
68	Mr. Randy Ledford	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>If in fact, the ODAFF currently does have responsibility to promote the industry and lacks sufficient resources to properly monitor and/or enforce compliance, ODAFF should step aside, serve as a partner, but not as a regulator. Clean water continues to be a very important and any and all compliance issues need to be dealt with by the EPA at this time.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Randy Ledford (b) (6)</p>
74	Mr. Ray Brookshire	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We already have chicken poop in our water and we don't need more cow poop.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Ray Brookshire (b) (6)</p>
80	Mr. Reginald King	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>This is a disgrace to the oklahoma residents and our politicians aren't even listening. There also trying to sell our water to texas, when will all this madness end and we the people don't even matter so we will make up for it at the polls. The republicans are very ruthless individuals living by two sets of rules and that is not what our constitution says.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Reginald King (b) (6)</p>
108	Mr. Rodney & Terri Jones	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO'S adhere to the clean Water Act, and also have a dangerous conflict of interest: How can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Rodney &amp; Terri Jones  (b) (6)</p>
66	Mr. Scott Hood	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>As the National Leadership Council member of Trout Unlimited in Oklahoma I represent over 900 members of Trout Unlimited in the State of Oklahoma and I am confident that I can speak for nearly every single one of them that this is a very bad idea. This is a classic example of the fox guarding the hen house and it should not be allowed.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Scott Hood (b) (6)</p>
50	Mr. Steve Trammell	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Former Attorney General Edmondson, fought to protect the Illinois River from runoff that came from large industrial chicken farms. Large scale cattle and hog operations would present the same hazards Edmonson battled then. With the budget cuts currently happening in state agencies manpower to enforce clean water provisions does not exist.</p> <p>In order to protect the water of Oklahoma this application should be denied.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Steve Trammell  (b) (6)</p>
104	Mr. Thomas Bisanar	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The continued pollution of surface water will hurt us all.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Thomas Bisanar (b) (6)</p>
54	Mr. Thomas Sanford	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Water is a public resource that demands real protection.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Thomas Sanford</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
98	Mr. Warren Osborn	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Our health should be your top priority not paying lip service to Big Business.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Warren Osborn (b) (6)</p>
81	Mrs. Angela Moffatt	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>If the agency has a conflict of interest, it should not be allowed to police CAFO pollution. Personally, I find the concept of CAFO operations abhorrent and unnatural. Large grazing animals were not intended to live in tiny lots filled with their own feces. The land cannot manage that much pollution, the animals have horrible living conditions, and the run off pollutes water far removed from these so called farms. They need to be eliminated, but in the meantime, at least regulated more strictly.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Angela Moffatt (b) (6)</p>
88	Mrs. Candace Hibbard Lillie	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We live beside Grand Lake. As an attendee of the recent watershed conference, i am quite sure this matter is of direct concern to me and all my neighbors.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Candace Hibbard Lillie  (b) (6)</p>
90	Mrs. Connie Seibold	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Concentrated animal feeding operations are bad for consumers because of the antibiotics used to reduce diseases caused by overcrowding.</p> <p>The OK Dept. of Agriculture has already proved that it cares nothing about people who buy the food, the animals that suffer or the responsible family farmers that have to compete with these corporate practices. Why should it also be allowed to regulate the damage done to our scarce and precious water as the result of chemicals and animal waste products?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Connie Seibold (b) (6)</p>
33	Mrs. Crystal Allen	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is just disgusting</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Crystal Allen  (b) (6)</p>
94	Mrs. Janet Hornsby	Oct 18, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I am against CAFO'S in the first place because of the danger they pose to clean water. I oppose the ODAFF application.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Janet Hornsby  (b) (6)</p>
58	Mrs. Joni Davis	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please consider the safety of our water. It is by far the most important asset we have in Oklahoma.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Joni Davis (b) (6)</p>
109	Mrs. Lorri Redmon	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please protect our precious water!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Lorri Redmon  (b) (6)</p>
32	Mrs. Mildred Banks	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We in Northeast Oklahoma have been overburdened by large scale farming operations polluting our water. We need more regulation, not less. ODAFF should not take over permitting, because they have a conflict of interest and inadequate staff to do the job effectively.</p> <p>Please, keep permitting federal and deny this request.</p> <p>Thank you, Rev. Mildred Banks, Tulsa, OK</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Mildred Banks (b) (6)</p>
73	Mrs. Nancy Sander	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>We are cattle ranchers, and have interest in protecting the rights of animal producers in Oklahoma. However, there will be a transparent conflict of interest if the Department of Agriculture administers any clean water protection authority. The conflict is obvious, and regulators have the responsibility to prevent this conglomerate of conflicting interests! I hope they see the simplistic power grab in this proposal, and put an end to the debate! This is a mistake to be avoided.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Nancy Sander  (b) (6)</p>
82	Ms. Amanda Webster	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Farming of animals is bad for the animals, and bad for the population and environment directly surrounding the CAFOs. Evidence shows the toxicity of animal protein to humans. A mountain of evidence also exists regarding the ill effects of pollution from these wretched places. It's bad enough they don't care about the lives of these animals, but to push the pollution out to the human population is beyond acceptable.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Amanda Webster  (b) (6)</p>
70	Ms. Andrea Smith	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Let's stop this, we need the forest. Where is the wildlife going to live? The farmers need some help too; we need to wake up.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.  From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Andrea Smith (b) (6)</p>
100	Ms. Ann Martin	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Stop your mean spirited ways. The republicans are the ones</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>responsible for the 20% reduction in funding. They don't care about the people. All they care about is making sure people will come to the State of Oklahoma and spend money thus contributing to their pocket books. They will spend tons of OUR tax money making everything beautiful (I am not against this) and doing nothing to help the citizens. Get your priorities straight with our tax dollars. The people come first. It's not your money, it's ours. Do right thing for the citizens of Oklahoma..</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Ann Martin  (b) (6)</p>
41	Ms. Beth Skye	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have read the letter as written and am in total agreement with the facts stated. Water is an endangered resource and we are responsible for making decisions that protect it over the interests of business.</p> <p>Beth Skye</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Beth Skye (b) (6)</p>
38	Ms. Darlene Litton	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please consider the impact of this decision. Our state was once beautiful, but greedy business owners offered a few jobs in exchange for free reign to over-pollute it. Our land has been poisoned enough. Don't let the love of money continue the downhill run of un-checked</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>bad business practices.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Darlene Litton (b) (6)</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
72	Ms. dawn armstrong	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please do not let this happen!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. dawn armstrong  (b) (6)</p>
110	Ms. Gail Sloop	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please think about the 7th generation and not wasting our natural resources.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Gail Sloop  (b) (6)</p>
55	Ms. Ingrid Young	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Ingrid Young  (b) (6)</p>
102	Ms. Jenny Woodruff	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>this is not good for oklahoma or the planet!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Jenny Woodruff  (b) (6)</p>
69	Ms. Judy Ann Davis	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>For Reasons of the Aforementioned, I oppose the ODAFF application.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Judy Ann Davis (b) (6)</p>
35	Ms. Katherine Owen	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please do what is right for our planet.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Katherine Owen</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
71	Ms. Kathy Nix	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Act Now! Please Stop the Department of Agriculture from Rubber Stamping CAFO's</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Kathy Nix  (b) (6)</p>
87	Ms. Linda Gibson	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The contamination of water affects every citizen and our future in the most basic of life necessities. As a retired State Employee I am aware of the many cuts in State Employee front line positions. The very jobs that would indeed monitor the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>If Okla. is to grow and its population to become healthy, we must safeguard our air and water. We must not cater to any industry at the expense of pollution for all! While we are at it, lets get steroids and growth hormone stimulants out of the cattle industry. This is about so much more than profit and gain for one industry.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Linda Gibson  (b) (6)</p>
65	Ms. Martha Holland	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 212 946 239">Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p data-bbox="670 279 862 306">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 346 1463 575">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 615 1203 642">Water is the most important issue of our time.</p> <p data-bbox="670 682 1143 709">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 749 1471 978">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1018 1243 1045">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1085 1463 1247">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1287 1463 1415">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1455 1398 1482">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1522 1471 1717">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1757 1438 1850">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1890 1260 1917">4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Martha Holland (b) (6)</p>
85	Ms. Mary Francis	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry can NOT ensure large CAFO operations adhere to discharge limits under the Clean Water Act, because they basically promote these businesses, not regulate. Read their MISSION STATEMENT. The Dept of Agriculture is about providing "consultation and advice" to the industry and "increasing the contribution of agriculture to the economy."</p> <p>READ the issues this bad proposal creates - see below!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Mary Francis (b) (6)</p>
52	Ms. Mercedes Lackey	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This proposal is ridiculous. The ODAFF does not have the resources to ensure CAFO's adhere to the Clean Water Act, and also has a dangerous conflict of interest: how can a Department promote the very industry they are also supposed to police?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Mercedes Lackey (b) (6)</p>
57	Ms. Michael Tiffany		<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Businesses these days are getting away with murder, so please stop giving them everything that they want, and start thinking of public protection.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Michael Tiffany (b) (6)</p>
103	Ms. Rebecca Oberlin	<p>Oct 18, 2012 Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733 Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Keep our water healthy and clean. We don't need unhealthy bacteria in our water or the outbreak of nasty diseases as a result of questionable oversight.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Rebecca Oberlin (b) (6)</p>
44	Ms. Roberta Wright	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>DON'T DO IT</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Roberta Wright (b) (6)</p>
48	Ms. Robin Feusner	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith, I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>this came up when BRAD HENRY was governor. I then wrote about this to get this stopped I gave them suggestions and ideas on how to deal with it. the state legislature rubber stamped it.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Robin Feusner (b) (6)</p>
111	Ms. Sally Blevins	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Ms. Smith, please work to keep Oklahoma's water safe from the large corporate livestock "farms" that pollute our water and water systems. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Sally Blevins  (b) (6)</p>
64	Ms. Sally Hill	<p>Oct 18, 2012  Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please consider the environment and the health of the public.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Sally Hill (b) (6)</p>
96	Ms. Susan Hovis Sikes	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please allow for proper oversight to help keep our water clean. I would also like to see government encouragement to revert some of these giant beef factories back to sustainable farms.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Susan Hovis Sikes  (b) (6)</p>
60	Ms. Traci Reeve	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF application</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Traci Reeve (b) (6)</p>
36	Steven Pritchard	<p>Oct 18, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Comments: I oppose the ODAFF application</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Steven Pritchard  (b) (6)</p>
113	Dr. James Bethel	4	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr. James Bethel (b) (6)</p>
116	Mr. Thomas Kovach	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please do not let the fox guard the hen-house. We have had major issues with water quality and we must not let up on the safeguards by shifting oversight to those whose job it is to promote the industry that is doing the polluting.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mr. Thomas Kovach (b) (6)</p>
118	Mrs. Jenilyn Spates	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>(ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Protecting our water supply should be taken seriously, especially by the people we trust to hold these positions.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Jenilyn Spates  (b) (6)</p>
121	Mrs. Mary Lea Wallace	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>CAFO effluent can harm health, land productivity, and land values. This industrialized livestock production needs to be regulated by agencies devoted to protecting the public interest. Thank you, Mary Lea Wallace</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Mary Lea Wallace  (b) (6)</p>
112	Ms. Barbara Bannon	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This would be inappropriate and a violation of public trust.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Barbara Bannon (b) (6)</p>
117	Ms. Catherine Johnson	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I adamantly oppose the ODAFF application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes. This needs to remain under the EPA. Keep my water clean, respect and honor treaties between the US and Indiginous people as to water control, and don't you dare sell it to anyone including TEXAS!!!</p> <p>Catherine Johnson 2246 NW 35th ST Oklahoma City, OK 73112</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Catherine Johnson  (b) (6)</p>
114	Ms. Cynthia Williams	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is outrageous !</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">s (b) (6)</p>
119	Ms. Joy Avery	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Recently, the City of Tulsa has added Chloramine as well as Chlorine to the city's water system. I personally have lost 55 Koi of my Koi pond of 15 years directly due to this addition. The City would not have to add another Poison to our water if the water were allowed to remain UNPOLLUTED. Chicken and Hog farmers are to blame. Huge Corporations should not be allowed to control whether OK residents are able to drink pure water. The Almighty Dollar is once again determining whether the Earth is allowed to remain habitable. How can the State of Oklahoma allow this to happen?</p> <p>Joy Avery Granddaughter of Cyrus Stevens Avery, Father of Route 66</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Joy Avery  (b) (6)</p>
115	Ms. Maria Welding	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF application</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Maria Welding (b) (6)</p>
120	Ms. Robin Patten	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Clean water is important for everyone.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Robin Patten</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		(b) (6)
122	Ms. Shelli Kitchens	<p>Oct 19, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is clearly wrong and pushing it under the carpet is setting our future generations up to have to find a way to clean up this nightmare of a mess. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations should be halted at once, it's inhumane and it causes dangerous invironmental damage that will directly effect humans. It's absurd this has been allowed to go on for so very very long. The right thing to do is being urged, do it.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ms. Shelli Kitchens (b) (6)</p>
125	Adrienne Rogers	4	<p>Oct 20, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Adrienne Rogers  (b) (6)  UNITED STATES</p>
123	Mr. Kim Roberts	<p>Oct 20, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>What can be more precious to human beings than clean safe water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Kim Roberts (b) (6)</p>
124	Ms. Jenny Arrington	<p>Oct 20, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>For the following reasons</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Jenny Arrington  (b) (6)</p>
126	Ms. Leslie Bradford	<p>Oct 20, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leslie Bradford Moore, OK</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Leslie Bradford  (b) (6)</p>
127	Ms. Lydia Garvey	<p>Oct 20, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It violates the Clean Water Act, they don't have resources/inclination to enforce the CWA- Severe Conflict of Interest!!! Like the wolf guarding the henhouse- Highly inappropriate! I don't want cow shit/urine/chemicals in My water!!! Do your job- Protect Our lands, waters, health, &amp; wildlife! You work for citizens, Not industry! Your attention to this most urgent matter would be much appreciated by all present &amp; future generations of all species!</p> <p>Thank you  Lydia Garvey  Public Health Nurse</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Lydia Garvey  (b) (6)</p>
128	Mrs. Anneliese Henderson	Oct 21, 2012

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please consider the impact of the ODAFF application; we must do we can so to preserve our environment on ALL LEVELS. We must also consider our neighbors; they will be affected by this.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Anneliese Henderson  (b) (6)</p>
133	Dr. Jim Nelson	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>Save the Illinois River, Inc. (STIR) opposes the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The mission of the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture is to further production agriculture. Because of this, it would not be in the public's best interest for the department to control CAFO permits. The Department is subject to great pressure from the farm lobby including the Oklahoma Farm Bureau and Pork Producers Association.</p> <p>It has been our experience that the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture does not have the resources to adequately inspect factory farming operations and to enforce existing regulations.</p> <p>Many of the water quality problems we currently have in the Illinois River watershed are due to factory farms. The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture seems to have had little success in controlling the pollution from these farms.</p> <p>STIR feels that another Oklahoma agency which regulates water quality could do a better job of enforcing anti-pollution rules including CAFO permits.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,  Dr. Jim Nelson  (b) (6)</p>
135	Mr. L Scott Dittner	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I oppose the ODAFF application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes. The river/lake systems in all of Oklahoma have seen dramatic levels of pollutants increase due to the level of animal and chemical sewage that has been dumped in the run-off of these vital water resources. One of our most valuable resources is our water supply and we are damaging this commodity in the midst of drought conditions. We should be increasing our monitoring of these resources instead of turning them over to some organization who is tied to the very organizations/businesses that are trying to usurp the intent of our laws.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Scott Dittner  (b) (6)</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. L Scott Dittner (b) (6)</p>
130	Mr. Robert Justice	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I would rather have clean drinking water, and clean lakes and rivers than cheap beef or chicken! Stop this absurdity before you destroy our water supply!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Robert Justice  (b) (6)</p>
131	Ms. Bobbie Daily	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>As a resident of northeastern Oklahoma, I already see too many permits being issued to poultry growers, which are too small to be considered a CAFO, but are large enough to contribute non-point source pollution to the Illinois River watershed. I strongly believe the permitting function should remain with the EPA, and believe that it is a conflict of interest, plus even perhaps an ethical question to have the Dept of Agric in charge of permitting. Furthermore, the EPA should be able to fulfill their responsibilities, duties and original purpose of enforcing regulatory standards, WITHOUT POLITICAL INTERFERENCE. This agency must be able to operate as intended, for the safety of our natural resources, beyond the dollar to be made at the moment.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Bobbie Daily (b) (6)</p>
132	Ms. Deanna Homer	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The environmental impact of confined animals' waste is horrendous. Not to mention the poorer health value of the beef compared to cattle that are totally grass fed.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Deanna Homer (b) (6)</p>
129	Ms. Denise Deason-Toyne	<p>Oct 22, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>The mission of the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture is to further production agriculture. Because of this, it would not be in the public's best interest for the department to control CAFO permits. The Department is subject to great pressure from the farm lobby including the Oklahoma Farm Bureau and Pork Producers Association. It has been our experience that the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture does not have the resources to adequately inspect factory farming operations and to enforce existing regulations. Many of the water quality problems we currently have in the Illinois River watershed are due to factory farms. The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture seems to have had little success to controlling the pollution from these farms. STIR feels that another Oklahoma agency which regulates water quality could do a better job of enforcing anti-pollution rules including CAFO permits.</p> <p>Sincerely, Denise Deason-Toyne Save the Illinois River, Inc. President</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Ms. Denise Deason-Toyne  (b) (6)</p>
141	Mr. James Nimmo	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>How can a Department POLICE the very industry they are also supposed to PROMOTE?</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. James Nimmo (b) (6)</p>
137	Mr. Richard Davis	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have been involved with a feedlot that is near my home. In the past the facility was not being managed properly. They had dust and water problem at the facility and carried over to ours, and neighbor's homes and property. We complained to the ODAFF several times, and they failed to do anything about the facility. Only when we complained to the ODEQ and the EPA did anything happen. In fact the facility now has numerous EPA administrative orders against them and has had to rebuild and change operation procedures to remedy their pollution of our air and water. The facility is still being sanctioned by the EPA to clean up their facility and improve their best management practices. The EPA has been doing a water study for over 6 years, and has determined that the facility has indeed polluted the water in the area, and must adhere the EPA orders.</p> <p>The ODAFF did nothing and told us the facility in compliance at that time. The EPA ruled otherwise and immediately places the facility under administrative orders, and to come up with plans of action to reduce and eliminate the pollution the facility was responsible for.</p> <p>What has made the ODAFF think that now they have the expertise to approve a permit when they can't determine that pollution exists?</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>The ODAFF tried to make us believe they the feedlot was good for the community and or the State of Oklahoma, without even thoroughly investigating our concerns. They simply tried to ignore us. This was a complete conflict of interest in my mind due to the ODAFF trying to please the large agricultural company without any regard to the surrounding properties and neighbors.</p> <p>I therefore oppose the ODAFF application in its entirety.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Richard Davis  (b) (6)</p>
136	Mr. rick poland	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is a ridiculous idea. The OK Dept of Ag does a very poor job of regulating the industry when it comes to pollution. Oklahoma's state government has been cut to the bone and does not have the financial resources to take on this task.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. rick poland (b) (6)</p>
140	Mrs. Shirley Driever	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I would ask that you check EPA's files regarding a CAFO located in Watonga, OK, Blaine County. The problems stem from ODAFF's failure to monitor &amp; assist people that live in the area. The name of the facility is Wheeler Brothers Feedlot &amp; is in close proximity to the town.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I would urge you to not okay a situation that will only get worse, as experiences dealing with the ODAFF to do their jobs regarding a CAFO is a joke &amp; yes, it was stated to us they don't have the manpower.</p> <p>I would look closely to the person and/or persons wanting this passed. This is not good for the State that you want to continue to be proud of.</p> <p>Water is very important &amp; it really needs to be taken care of. It is filth that comes from those facilities, both water &amp; air, etc.</p> <p>Please consider rejecting such an issue.</p> <p>Thank you for your time &amp; consideration. Shirley Driever, Rt 2, Box 325, Watonga, OK 73772</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Shirley Driever  (b) (6)</p>
142	Ms. Ann Bornholdt	<p>Oct 23, 2012  Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>If we are trying to be efficient with our tax dollars, why do we want to take on additional administration duties? What will be the source of funds for program administration? I believe the agency charged with policing compliance should be separate from the agency responsible for promoting the activity. Just like it makes no sense to have Porche police our highway speed limits, it makes no sense for ODAFF to administer the NPDES program.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Ann Bornholdt (b) (6)</p>
143	Ms. darla reynolds-sparks	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have witnessed what run-offs do to fresh water lakes in N.E. Oklahoma. Those run-offs come from chicken farms all over N.W. Arkansas. Our beautiful lakes have become sludge caused algae and unfit for any use.</p> <p>The fresh, drinking water is soon to be more precious than gold, diamonds or dollars as this planet becomes more and more contaminated by industries fouling our waters.....It must not continue.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. darla reynolds-sparks  (b) (6)</p>
139	Ms. Susans Singh	<p>Oct 23, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Water is our most precious resource. We started to ration water this summer in Tulsa, so it is clear it may not always be abundant. We must safeguard water.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Susans Singh (b) (6)</p>
145	Mr. Ed Brocksmith	<p>Oct 24, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I believe it would be a mistake to delegate CAFO permitting authority to the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture and I hope EPA will not agree to this proposal.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>An Oklahoma agency that deals with water quality enforcement would be more appropriate for this authority in my opinion. Water quality certainly has not been a priority with the Oklahoma Agriculture Department or we would not have the pollution problems we now have in the Illinois River watershed</p> <p>The Agriculture Department effectively promotes production agriculture and is heavily influenced by the farm lobby including the Oklahoma Farm Bureau and pork producers. I don't believe the department can be objective in regulating factory farming operations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ed Brocksmith Tahlequah, OK</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Ed Brocksmith  (b) (6)</p>
144	Mrs. E. Sharon Wilson	<p>Oct 24, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that the (ODAFF) could be unbiased on issues dealing with feet lots. Our water supply needs more protection, not less.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts.</p>



Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. E. Sharon Wilson  (b) (6)</p>
146	Ms. Shirley Burton	<p>Oct 24, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Shirley Burton  (b) (6)</p>
147	Mrs. Cathy Thompson	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please consider the effect that your actions will have upon generations of Oklahoma children. Come together for a solution, this should be a no brainer, if we know it can produce harmful effects then it would be irresponsible to ignore the concerns that we all share.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Cathy Thompson  (b) (6)</p>
150	Mrs. Marcy Scott	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Our families have the right to be as healthy as possible. Without clean water that will be impossible!!!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Marcy Scott  (b) (6)</p>
154	Mrs. Monica Griffin	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p data-bbox="670 243 862 275">Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p data-bbox="670 310 1463 541">I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p data-bbox="670 577 1442 777">Have the detriments and dangers of CAFOs not already been detailed and elucidated enough to stop this type of operation? Please, for the safety of our food supply, and for the sake of our environment, do not okay this application.</p> <p data-bbox="670 812 1143 844">1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="670 879 1474 1113">The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1148 1245 1180">2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p data-bbox="670 1215 1466 1381">The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1417 1469 1549">Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1585 1398 1617">3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p data-bbox="670 1652 1474 1852">As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1887 1442 1946">Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Monica Griffin  (b) (6)</p>
149	Mrs. Suan Schmidt	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Don't let the Oklahoma Dept of Ag, Food and Forestry (ODAFF) take over responsibility for protecting Oklahoma's water supply from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO). I trust the EPA to protect my interest more than I trust ODAFF. Their budgets have been cut. They may want the job so they can collect the permit fees but I don't have faith in their intention of performing the level of investigation, oversight, and litigation required to prevent abuse by the agriculture industry. Adding four new staff, of which three would be mid-level management, makes no sense. There needs to be more enforcement officers and they need to know they are expected to uncover and eliminate abuses that lead to water contamination. Right now the signals are mixed.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Suan Schmidt (b) (6)</p>
148	Mrs. Teresa Tucker-Trainum	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>This is like having the hawk run the chicken house. It is a conflict of interest!</p> <p>Please do not allow the Ok Dept of Ag to decide the discharges for the CAFO's in my state. They do not have the manpower or budget</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>to do it and it will fall along the wayside and our waters will become more polluted.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mrs. Teresa Tucker-Trainum  (b) (6)</p>
155	Ms. B. Geary	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the ODAFF application.</p> <p>Actually, It is not enough for me to say I 'oppose' the ODAFF application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program. I am absolutely appalled at the very idea. I need a word that is a lot stronger than 'opposed'.</p> <p>Oklahoma water quality would suffer if this application were granted. ODAFF would obviously have a conflict of interest. I believe the new ODAFF responsibility to protect water quality would likely take a back seat to ODAFF's traditional role of promoting the interests of large CAFOs.</p> <p>I believe ODAFF has neither the expertise nor the budget to administer the discharge program.</p> <p>As a resident of Tulsa (who grew up with pristine water quality here) I am all too aware of what CAFO discharge can do to water quality! I find it outrageous to weaken in any way the little protection Tulsa and the rest of Oklahoma have against CAFO pollution.</p> <p>Lastly, it doesn't make sense to me, given the interstate (both into Oklahoma and leaving Oklahoma) water pollution caused by CAFOs, to have anyone but a federal entity regulating CAFO discharge.</p> <p>No, No, NO, NO, NO, NO, No to this application!</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>B. Geary Tulsa (b) (6)</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. B. Geary (b) (6)</p>
152	Ms. Gwen Ingram	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Gwen Ingram  (b) (6)</p>
153	Ms. Jean McMahon	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith  1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I have worried about pig manure runoff for years. Okla had made a law that prevented concerned citizens from taking specimens of</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>water to test for problems...Now they want the fox to gaurd the henhouse..The dept of agriculture works for BIG AG (industriaqalized operations)...No Good can come from this conflict of interest...Big AG supports research and bribes Lawmakers..Please EPA stop this madness going on in Oklahoma....Save our water and our land and our Farms...do your Job PLEASE Thank you</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capitol to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Jean McMahon (b) (6)</p>
156	Ms. Susanne Adams	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Here's why:</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			Ms. Susanne Adams (b) (6)
151	Ms. tam jordan	4	<p>Oct 25, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>DON'T LET THE FOXES GUARD THE CHICKEN HOUSES!!!</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. tam jordan (b) (6)</p>
160	Mr. Mark Manley	4	<p>Oct 29, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>Please reconsider this decision to make the ODAFF the administrator of this program. The world we live in is under attack from pollutants at so many levels. Life on this earth is under attack and we need a group to champion our environment.</p> <p>Mark Manley</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p> <p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state,</p>



Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mr. Mark Manley (b) (6)</p>
161	Ms. Patrick Murphy	4	<p>Oct 30, 2012</p> <p>Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Ms. Smith,</p> <p>I oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes.</p> <p>I don't trust Oklahoma politicians to act in the best interest of the public. Money means everything to the boys in Oklahoma City.</p> <p>1) The ODAFF has a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The mission of the ODAFF is primarily to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers and promote agricultural trade and production. This provides a clear conflict of interest with ensuring large CAFO operations adhere to the discharge limits under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>2) The ODAFF does not have adequate resources</p> <p>The state of Oklahoma has recently undergone significant budget cuts. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013 the department underwent a 20% reduction in funding.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Additionally, the ODAFF does not have the human capital to administer this program. They have not done so in the past and do not have the expertise to ensure full compliance with the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>3) Oklahoma has a history of problems with CAFO operations</p> <p>As evidenced by the many lawsuits against CAFO's in our state, including the State of Oklahoma suing CAFO's in Arkansas for excess nitrogen and phosphorous emissions into our rivers, Oklahoma has a dark history with CAFO's.</p> <p>Granting this permit would take away one of the few protections Oklahomans have against CAFO's and further endanger our water quality.</p> <p>4) Oklahoma CAFO operations impact other states</p> <p>As stated above, Arkansas CAFO operations impact Oklahoma. Oklahoma operations, likewise, directly impact other states. The most logical body to administer the permitting process is the federal government, which has an obligation to protect all US water sources and not a single state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ms. Patrick Murphy (b) (6)</p>
299	Kurt G. Robinson	<p>October 25, 2012 Ms. Diane Smith 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733 RE: Oklahoma Agriculture Dept – CAFOs Dear Ms. Smith:</p> <p>As an Oklahoma citizen and stakeholder on the Illinois River of NE Oklahoma, I strongly oppose the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry's (ODAFF) application to administer a partial National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for discharges under the jurisdiction of the Department as stated in Section 1; 3; 101 of Title 27A of the Oklahoma statutes. Please allow me to simplify the argument by stating that the pollution problems in the Illinois River watershed have been highly studied, publicized and litigated. There is strong evidence that the poultry industry CAFOs are at the crux of the problem, and there is no doubt that the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture is highly influenced by the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, the poultry industry, cattle and pork industries and other pro-agriculture entities. To insure that our rivers are safe from polluted runoff from CAFO operations and the land application of their waste products, it is imperative that an agency in charge of permitting is not being</p>

Comment ID	Commenter		Comment
			<p>influenced directly or indirectly by the very people that are receiving such permits.  Please rule against this ill-advised application.  Sincerely,  Kurt G. Robinson  (b) (6)</p>
138	Joe Neal Hampton		<p>Tue, 23 Oct 2012  Ms. Smith</p> <p>Please be advised that the below listed organizations support the Environmental Protection Agency giving NPDES delegation to the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry. Thank you.... Joe Neal Hampton</p> <p>Joe Neal Hampton  Chief Executive Officer  Oklahoma Grain and Feed Assn.  Oklahoma Agribusiness Retailers Assn.  Oklahoma Seed Trade Assn.  2309 N. 10th St. , Suite E  Enid, OK 73701</p>
298	David Ocamb		<p>Wednesday, November 07, 2012</p> <p>Regional Administrator  US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6  Fountain Place 12th Floor, Suite 1200  1445 Ross Avenue  Dallas, TX 75202-2733</p> <p>Dear Regional Administrator,</p> <p>On behalf of the Oklahoma Chapter of the Sierra Club, I am providing these written comments to the request submitted by the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture Food and Forestry (“ODAFF”) to obtain approval for its Agricultural Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (the “AgPDES”). Sierra Club’s Oklahoma Chapter strongly opposes the attempt by the ODAFF to obtain delegation for any part of the National Pollution Elimination Discharge System (herein “NPDES”) based upon ODAFF’s currently published plans and proposed rules.</p> <p>In summary, we have five (5) primary comments which our members believe each independently prohibit the ODAFF from obtaining primacy over any portion of the NPDES. These issues are summarized as follows:</p> <p>1) The ODAFF proposed rules would create a special class of Animal Feeding Operations (“AFOs) which would be regulated and</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>permitted as medium sized Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (“CAFOs”) under federal law. Yet, under the proposed ODAFF regulation there do not appear to be any equivalent permitting or regulatory requirements. As a result, the ODAFF’s proposed rules are by their very nature “less stringent” than the federal CAFO requirements.</p> <p>Specifically on this point, ODAFF uses the term “discharge” to create less stringent regulation. Under ODAFF’s proposed rules, discharges become important when determining whether an AFO should be classified as a CAFO. The EPA’s rules do not contain this distinction. Specifically, ODAFF currently interprets its rule to require an actual discharge prior to a permit being necessary. Accordingly, an AFO with between 37,5000 and 124,999 chickens (other than laying hens) is not considered a CAFO by the ODAFF unless there is a proven discharge. Similarly, an AFO with 125,000 chickens (other than laying hens) is not considered a CAFO unless there is an actual discharge.</p> <p>These less stringent requirements conflict with and are less stringent than the EPA’s CAFO rules. The EPA’s CAFO rules would, for instance, require the operation of a chicken house with more than 100,000 birds be considered a CAFO, and would require such an operation to obtain a NPDES permit, and be regulated by the EPA.</p> <p>Accordingly, the ODAFF’s proposed rules violate the requirements of Section 510 of the Clean Water Act (prohibiting state regulation which is “less stringent” than the federal requirements).</p> <p>2) The ODAFF proposed rules provide no guidance regarding ODAFF’s plan concerning how it will apply Oklahoma’s Water Quality Standards to AFOs and CAFOs located within High Quality Waters (herein “HQWs”) and Outstanding Resource Waters (herein “ORWs”).</p> <p>Specifically, ODAFF has not proposed special regulations for AFOs in sensitive watershed areas, such as the Illinois River Watershed. While ODAFF does propose an anti-degradation review as part of its permitting procedures, as set forth in OAC § 785:45-3-2 (a portion of Oklahoma’s Water Quality Standards), and proposes to restrict discharges in accordance with OAC 785:46, Subchapter 13 (which are the Oklahoma Water Resources Board’s rules implementing the State’s Water Quality Standards), the proposed ODAFF rules do not prohibit new AFOs within HQWs or ORWs</p> <p>Thus, an AFO which would be considered a CAFO by the EPA may nonetheless be allowed to construct and operate within a High Quality Water, Outstanding Resource Water watershed, or Scenic River watershed without requiring an AgPDES permit.</p> <p>This entire question is essentially unaddressed in ODAFF’s plan, making the plan unworkable. Moreover, ODAFF’s deliberate</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>ignorance of this issue makes its proposed AgPDES fall below the federal standards relative to ORWs and the standards applicable to other point source discharges in Oklahoma.</p> <p>3) The ODAFF's penalties for violation of the AgPDES appear to be less stringent than the federal penalties for the violation of the same rules. ODAFF state that it "understands and agrees to follow the principles outlined in applicable EPA CWA penalty policies and any future revisions of these policies." Yet, it is believed that ODAFF's proposed penalties are significantly less than those imposed by federal requirements. Accordingly, ODAFF's proposed rules are "less stringent" than federal requirements, and fail to pass muster under Section 510 of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>4) ODAFF proposes insufficient staffing for enforcement. While ODAFF commits that "ODAFF shall maintain a vigorous enforcement program[,] ODAFF has instead dedicated only one Full Time Equivalent "FTE" for enforcement for the entire state of Oklahoma. Spreading one person across the entire state to even attempt enforcement is patently ridiculous and cannot yield "vigorous enforcement." Assuming the highest level of good faith on the part of the person responsible for enforcement by ODAFF, it is not possible for one person to regulate hog and chicken farms from Beaver to Idabel and from Miami to Lawton. Accordingly, ODAFF's entire program is "less stringent" than federal enforcement currently existing, and fails to meet the requirements of Section 510 of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>5) It is not apparent who should be permitted to operate AFOs and CAFOs in Oklahoma. In most situations, chicken CAFOs operate under a strict program and set of contractual requirements imposed by "integrators." Integrators are large companies, like Tyson's Foods or Simmons. These integrators contractually have the right, and in our experience often dictate the way that wastes from CAFOs are managed. Accordingly, we believe that such integrators should be regulated, and the requirements of their contracts which would impact permit requirements subjected to scrutiny to ensure that the operation of a CAFO meets the requirements of the Clean Water Act. The ODAFF proposed rule neglects entirely to address the question of large integrator control over the animal wastes, and as such fails to implement the requirements of the Clean Water Act by ensuring that those persons</p> <p>As you are aware, members of the Oklahoma Chapter of the Sierra Club own, use, rely upon, and recreate in the waters that can and sometimes already do receive wastes discharged from CAFOs. The problems of CAFO discharges of animal wastes are not new in Oklahoma, but instead are a continuing issue that must be dealt with. These issues are increasing as more and more hog and chicken CAFOs are established in Oklahoma. ODAFF's proposed rules fail entirely to address the concerns of the public that presently are – and in the future would be – impacted by discharges of animal waste.</p>

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
		<p>Most disturbingly, ODAFF's rules appear to be constructed in such a way as to avoid regulation that is already required by federal rules. Accordingly, we strongly urge that you decline to delegate any authority to ODAFF under its plan as it is currently outlined.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the ODAFF's attempt to obtain a delegation of federal authority under Section 510 of the Clean Water Act. We urge that you deny ODAFF's request. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, our Legal Chair, Jason Aamodt, is available to speak on the phone at 918-706-6082.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>David Ocamb Director Sierra Club, Oklahoma Chapter</p> <p>--</p> <p>Warm Regards,</p> <p>David Ocamb Chapter Director Oklahoma Chapter of the Sierra Club <a href="http://oklahoma.sierraclub.org/">http://oklahoma.sierraclub.org/</a> Office: (405) 286-2277</p> <p>This is a personal message that does not necessarily represent the views of the Sierra Club.</p>